

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 2 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 2 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated November 19, 2009.

**Claim Objection:**

Claim 1 stands objected to for the specific reasons set forth in item 1, page 2 of the Action. The Examiner provides suggested claim language in item 1. As such, claim 1 has been amended to include the claim amendments suggested by the Examiner in item 1.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph:**

Claim 2 stands rejected as under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is submitted that claim 2 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claim 2 is requested.

**As To The Merits:**

As to the merits of this case, the Examiner sets forth the following rejection:

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the newly cited reference of Nakagawa et al., (U.S. Patent 6,086,261).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, now calls for *wherein the total crowning amount, defined as the sum of crowning amount of outer ring, the crowning amount of inner ring and two times the crowning amount of roller, is more than 50  $\mu$ m, and*

*the crowning ratio of the outer ring, defined as crowning amount of outer ring divided by the total crowning amount, is 40% or more, and the roller crowning ratio, defined as two times the roller crowning amount divided by the total crowning amount, is 20% or less.*

That is, claim 1 has been amended such that the total crowning amount is more than 50  $\mu$ m in order to clearly distinguish over the teachings of the Nakagawa reference.

In item 5, page 3 of the Action, the Examiner explicitly relies on the disclosure set forth in Fig. 9, and in column 13, lines 9-13 of the Nakagawa reference.

More specifically, Nakagawa discloses, in column 13, lines 9-13, the following:

The amount of crowning (the amount of drop) can be optionally set within the range of 1-6  $\mu\text{m}$  for the rolling surface 3c', 1-20  $\mu\text{m}$  for the raceway surface 1a', and 1-20  $\mu\text{m}$  for the raceway surface 2a' (10-50  $\mu\text{m}$  for compound crowning).

That is, while Nakagawa may disclose that the roller crowning may be 6  $\mu\text{m}$  and the inner and the outer ring crowning amounts may be 20  $\mu\text{m}$ , such configuration does not anticipate claim 1, since such configuration would not have a roller crowning ratio of 20% or less. That is, in Nakagawa, the roller crowning ratio defined as two times the roller crowning amount divided by the total crowning amount would be 12 divided by 52 or approximately 23%, which is greater than the 20% limit of the total crowning amount required in claim 1.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Nakagawa fails to anticipate claim 1, since such reference fails to disclose or fairly suggest the features of claim 1 regarding *wherein the total crowning amount, defined as the sum of crowning amount of outer ring, the crowning amount of inner ring and two times the crowning amount of roller, is more than 50  $\mu\text{m}$ , and*

*the crowning ratio of the outer ring, defined as crowning amount of outer ring divided by the total crowning amount, is 40% or more, and the roller crowning ratio, defined as two times the roller crowning amount divided by the total crowning amount, is 20% or less.*

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,  
**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**  
/THOMAS E. BROWN/

Thomas E. Brown  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,450  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/nrp